<u>REMARKS</u>

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance. The indication of allowed and allowable claims provided on page 5 of the Office Action is acknowledged with thanks.

Additionally, the undersigned appreciates with thanks the Examiner taking time to discuss this application in a telephone interview on February 9 and February 25, 2011.

As indicated in the Interview Summary posted February 17, 2011, the indication in the Office Action that claims 14-20 are allowable but objected to should read that claims 14-20 are allowed, as claims 14 and 15 do not depend from a rejected claim. Claims 4-8 are understood to be allowable if amended into independent form.

It is further gratefully acknowledged that after further discussion in the Interview of February 25, 2011, the rejection under Section 112 for indefiniteness of claims 9-13 has been reconsidered and withdrawn. This result was made of record in the Interview Summary posted on March 4, 2011.

Amendments to the Disclosure

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4, as indicated allowable by the Official Action. Claim 4 is canceled (without prejudice), and claim 5 is amended to depend from claim 1.

Claims 6 and 7, also indicated as allowable by the Official Action, are each amended into independent form incorporating all the subject matter of parent claim 1.

As the amendments to the claims are limited to canceling claims or adopts Examiner suggestions by incorporating allowable subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments are proper in view of MPEP § 714.13 (Section II). It is further respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter.

Entry of the amendments to the claims is thereby respectfully requested.

Formal Matters – Section 112, second paragraph

The Official Action rejected claim 9-13 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

This rejection, however, is understood to be reconsidered and withdrawn based on the telephone interview of February 25, 2011 (see above). Accordingly, claims 9-13 are believed to be in allowable condition.

Substantive Issues – Section 102

The Official Action rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Karytinos (US 4,918,899; "KARYTINOS").

In response, it is respectfully noted that claim 1 has been amended as indicated above to incorporate the patentable subject matter of dependent claim 4. It is therefore

respectfully submitted that the rejection under Section 102 has been rendered moot.

It is also respectfully submitted that all claims depending from claim 1 are believed to be patentable at least for being dependent from a patentable parent claim. Withdrawal of this rejection is thereby respectfully requested.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it will be apparent that Applicant has fully responded to the December 8, 2010 Official Action.

It is further respectfully submitted that all the claims presented herein, based at least on the Examiner's indications of allowable subject matter, are in allowable condition. In view of this, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims, as presented, and their early passage to issue.

The fee of $440 for the two independent claims added herewith, is being paid concurrently online by credit card.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the attorney for Applicant at the number set forth below if the Examiner is of the opinion that further discussion of this case would be helpful.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

_____/Jeremy G. Mereness/_____
Jeremy G. Mereness, Reg. No. 63,422
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
         (703) 979-4709

JGM/fb